IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.19146 of 1997

Dated: September 5, 2006

Between:

Mohd. Soheel Parveez, S/o. M.A. Samad, aged 27 years,
And others.

… Petitioners

And

State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Secretary,
School Education, Hyderabad, and others.

… Respondents

Order:

Petitioners, by this writ petition, seek Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in seeking to restrict the appointments of Urdu Teachers in Nizamabad District, purporting to follow the roster system contrary to the policy of the Government and thereby not calling the candidates for interview in the ratio of 1:3 as arbitrary and illegal.

2. Pursuant to the notification issued by the respondents for Special Recruitment Test, petitioners have submitted their applications and

appeared for written test on 12-07-1997. Their case is that though they have fared well in the said test, they were not called for interview. Their grievance is that the respondents have not followed the ratio of 1:3 in calling the candidates for interview.

3. Though counter affidavit has not been filed, learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that though minimum marks of fifty was prescribed in the written test, subsequently, the same was altered; accordingly merit list of all the candidates who appeared for the test has been received from the Director, SCERT, Hyderabad. He further submits that candidates were not called for oral interview in the ratio of 1:3 since the notification itself orders for implementation of rule of reservation. It is further submitted that pursuant to the notification, all the vacancies were filled up.

4. It is to be seen that the notification itself proclaims for implementation of rule of reservation and the vacancies have been filled up in accordance with the policy of the Government. As much as it is stated that pursuant to the notification, all the vacancies were filled up, no direction as sought for can be given at this stage.

5. The writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

September 5, 2006
MRR